

App. Serial No. 10/528,614
Docket No.: SG 020018 US

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 15 2006

Remarks

Claims 1-6 are currently pending in the patent application. For the reasons and arguments set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The non-final Office Action dated June 29, 2006 indicated an objection regarding the application title and listed the following rejection: claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Overtoom *et al.* (U.S. 6,732,218).

Regarding the objection to the application title, Applicant has provided a new descriptive title and requests that the objection be removed.

Applicant has amended claims 4-6 for clarification purposes only. Applicant notes that these amendments are not being made to overcome any issues of patentability raised by the rejections in the Office Action. The claims are patently distinguishable over the cited references for the reasons discussed below and are fully supported by the original disclosure. Applicant has also added new claims 7-8 which are fully supported by the original disclosure (see, *e.g.*, paragraph 0012).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(e) rejections of claims 1-6 because the cited portions of the Overtoom reference fail to correspond to all of the claimed limitations. Regarding independent claims 1 and 5 (and as relevant to the claims that depend therefrom), the Office Action fails to cite any portion of the Overtoom reference that corresponds to claimed limitations directed to a bus station arranged to operate in a second mode upon detection of the absence of a host station coupled to the second communications port. The Overtoom reference is directed to a USB hub that is compatible with dual-role devices such as USB On-the-Go (OTG) devices (see, *e.g.*, col. 1, lines 6-9). These devices are able to operate as either a host controller or as a peripheral device dependent on the particular use the device is undergoing at a specific time (see, *e.g.*, col. 1, lines 50-54); also at different points in time when the various devices become host of the system, the host functionality must be transferred according to the USB 2.0 specification and the OTG host negotiation protocol (see, *e.g.*, col. 3, lines 6-9). The Overtoom reference teaches that when a device desires to obtain host control the OTG hub 102 will transfer host control to that device in accordance with the host

App. Serial No. 10/528,614
Docket No.: SG 020018 US

negotiation protocol described in the OTG supplement to the USB 2.0 specification (see, *e.g.*, col. 4, lines 11-19). Therefore, the Overtoom reference teaches that the hub is compatible with dual-role devices which can operate as a host, not a bus station that is arranged to operate in a second mode upon detection of the absence of a host station coupled to the second port as in the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Section 102(e) rejections of claims 1 and 5 and claims 2-3 and 6, which depend from claims 1 and 5, are improper and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

Moreover, the cited portions of the Overtoom reference fail to correspond to claim 4 and claim 6 limitations directed to a bus station being arranged to operate under the control of system software, including host emulating software being arranged to emulate the presence of a host controller. The cited portion of the Overtoom reference teaches an OTG hub 102 that has OTG dual-role devices connected to the A-ports 202, and that the OTG hub waits for one of the external OTG devices to request host control of the USB bus (see, *e.g.*, col. 3, line 55 to col.4, line 10). The Overtoom reference does not teach a bus station arranged to operate under the control of system software emulating the presence of a host controller as in the claimed invention. Therefore, the Section 102(e) rejections of claims 4 and 6 are improper and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

App. Serial No. 10/528,614
Docket No.: SG 020018 US

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the attorney overseeing the application file, Adam L. Stroud, of Philips Corporation at (408) 474-9064.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(VLSI.495PA)

CUSTOMER NO. 24738